



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,178	07/05/2005	Michael Steiert	2002P19801WOUS	6618
28204	7590	09/27/2006		
SIEMENS SCHWEIZ AG I-47, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ALBISRIEDERSTRASSE 245 ZURICH, CH-8047 SWITZERLAND			EXAMINER TSIDULKO, MARK	
			ART UNIT 2875	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/541,178	STEIERT, MICHAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark Tsidulko	2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The submission of Preliminary amendment filed on 7/05/2005 is acknowledged. At this point claims 2-8 have been amended, claim 1 has been canceled and new claim 9 has been added. Thus, claims 2-9 are at issue in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter “*dial laundered on the circuit board*”, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It is also unclear what does Applicant mean by “*laundered*”?

The status of Claim 3 (i.e. if allowable or not) cannot be determined because of the vagueness of the claim

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 9, 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kino et al. (US 6,499,852).

Referring to Claims 9, 4 Kino et al. disclose (Figs.2, 3) an instrument cluster including a PCB [100], on which a light source [95] is provided, a frame [50] in which a PCB is held, a

display panel [10] arranged directly on the PCB (col.11, lines 1, 2) and a light guides [60], [70], [80] having incoupling (light entering) surface (Fig.4) and outcoupling (light outgoing) surface (Fig.8), and partially surrounding light sources [95] are held in the frame in an area adjoining the PCB.

Referring to Claim 5 Kino et al. disclose that the light source is LED (col.6, lines 51, 52).

Referring to Claim 6 Kino et al. disclose that the light guide deflects light between the incoupling surface (Fig.4) and outcoupling surface (Fig.8).

Referring to Claim 7 Kino et al. disclose that each light guide is made of plastic in one piece (Fig.2, col.5, lines 56-58) attached to the frame [50].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kino et al. (US 6,499,852) in view of Schommer (US 4,207,813).

Kino et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for dial printed on a circuit board.

Schommer discloses a circuit board with various forms of indicia (col.1, lines 36-39).

It allow decreasing quantity of parts of the device and simplifying assembling.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to provide the device of Kino et al. having a dial printed on the circuit board, as taught by Schommer, in order to decrease quantity of parts of the device and simplify the process of assembling.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kino et al. (US 6,499,852).

Kino et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for that the light guide and frame are produced in one piece using two-component injection molding process.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to produce the light guide and frame in one piece, in order to decrease quantity of parts of the device and simplify assembling. In addition, the Applicant is advised that it has been held by the courts that patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is disclosed, or suggested, by the Prior Art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Tsidulko whose telephone number is (571)272-2384. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for all communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.T.
September 20, 2006



Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800